

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Alecia Ghouralal,

Plaintiff,

v.

Paul Rambo; George Rambo; Thomas  
Nelson; Brandy Willey; Hung Nguyen; John  
Travers; and the Central Intelligence  
Agency,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.: 2:20-2875-BHH

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Alecia Ghouralal ("Plaintiff"), proceeding *pro se*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Paul Rambo, George Rambo, Thomas Nelson, Brandy Willey, Hung Nguyen, John Travers, and the Central Intelligence Agency ("Defendants"). (ECF No. 1.) In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02, D.S.C., the action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker for preliminary consideration. On August 25, 2020, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation ("Report"), outlining the issues and recommending that this case be summarily dismissed *with prejudice* and without service of process because it is frivolous. (ECF No. 11.) The Magistrate Judge further recommends that Plaintiff be advised that the continued filing of frivolous, malicious, abusive, or vexatious actions may result in the imposition of a pre-filing injunction and other sanctions as provided by law. Attached to the Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of her right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of receiving a copy. (*Id.* at 6.) To date, Plaintiff has not filed objections to the Report.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The

recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, the Court need not conduct a *de novo* review when a party makes only “general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). In the absence of a timely filed, specific objection, the Magistrate Judge’s conclusions are reviewed only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

As previously noted, Plaintiff has not filed any objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report. The Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s conclusions and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s thorough analysis. Finding no clear error, therefore, the Court adopts and incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 11), and dismisses this action *with prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. Plaintiff is hereby advised that **the continued filing of frivolous, malicious, abusive, or vexatious actions may result in the imposition of a pre-filing injunction and other sanctions as provided by law.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

November 17, 2020  
Greenville, South Carolina

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified that any right to appeal this Order is governed by Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.